

## **REMARKS**

Applicants submit that no new matter has been introduced by the amendments to the claims. Claims 1-34 and 42-46 are pending. No claim 39 was originally filed, but is noted as canceled for the record. Applicants amend Claim 1 to further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art and to expedite prosecution of the present application. Support for the amendment may be found in the Specification at least in paragraph [0024]. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

### **Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-34 and 42-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the best mode contemplated by the inventor has not been disclosed. Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejection because the Specification contains the best mode contemplated by the inventors at the time the application was filed. For example, the Specification states that the wrapper assumes the function of constantly querying the message queue 16 from the business component 12 to determine the existence of new messages (Specification, paragraph [0027]). The wrapper then employs a publication/subscription notification type of architecture to notify the queue connector 10 of a new message in the message queue 16 through the coupling 26 (Specification, paragraph [0029]). The queue connector 10, in turn, begins delivery of the message to the business component 12 (Specification, paragraph [0030]). Based on the above description, the Specification clearly describes a method for employing a publication/subscription notification type of architecture via a wrapper for a message queue that does not employ a publication/subscription notification type of architecture. Although there is no requirement in the statute that Applicants point out which of their embodiments they consider to be their best, the Specification actually states that the above described process is the "preferred" embodiment (Specification, paragraphs [0028] and [0029]). *See* MPEP §2165.01. Therefore, as long as that the disclosure includes the best mode contemplated by an applicant at the time of filing, which Applicants' assert that it does, the best mode requirement is satisfied. *Id.* Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to Claims 1-34 and 42-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to disclose the best mode be withdrawn.

### **Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-2, 7-16, 18-21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williamson et al. (U.S. 6,915,519) (hereinafter "Williamson") and further in view of Lai (U.S.

2005/0044197) (hereinafter “Lai”). Claims 3-6, 17, 22, 24-34 and 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williamson and further in view of Lai and further in view of Wookey (U.S. 2004/0230982) (hereinafter “Wookey”). Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williamson in view of Lai in view of Wookey as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of Applicants Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter “AAPA”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections at least on the grounds that the combination of the cited references does not teach or suggest each and every element of the limitations as recited in Claims 1-34 and 42-46. For example, the combination of Williamson and Lai does not teach or suggest *a first queue to manage message services, the first queue employing a notification type architecture other than a publication/subscription type notification; a wrapper to enable the first queue to operate a publication/subscription notification type of architecture* as recited in Claim 1 (emphasis added). Applicants emphasize that Claim 1 is reciting a notification type architecture, i.e., how a message queue notifies a client of a message in the queue, and not simply the underlying queue structure (such as a JMS queue or a Websphere MQ queue). For instance, Claim 1 states that *the first queue employs a notification type architecture other than a publication/subscription type notification*. A publication/subscription type notification is one in which a message queue publishes (i.e., notifies and/or sends) messages to clients that have previously subscribed with the message queue (*See Specification*, paragraph [0023]). As stated in Applicant’s Specification on page 10, lines 1-15, examples of queues that employ a non-publication/subscription type architecture includes a polling queue (i.e., the queue must be polled for any new messages), a dead-letter queue, a system command queue, a system default queue, a channel queue, an event queue, a model queue, and a dynamic queue. Regardless of the type of queue of message queue, the wrapper process is operable to reduce the process load on the business component by removing the requirement for the business component to constantly query the message queue directly to determine the existence of new messages (*See Specification*, page 10, lines 17-21). Hence, the present disclosure could also apply to any message queue system for which a JMS enable wrapper could be applied, regardless of the underlying queue structure or type of notification architecture. *See Specification*, page 10, lines 2-4 (emphasis added).

In contrast to Claim 1, Williamson does not teach or suggest anything relating to a notification type architecture of a message queue. Williamson discloses a process for using WebSphere MQseries messaging services in conjunction with JMS libraries. The Office Action admits that Williamson does not teach or suggest the above recited limitations of Claim 1, but instead alleges that Lai discloses the above features. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Lai discloses enabling two different message queue structures having different data transport protocols to communicate using a SOAP envelope. For instance, Lai states on page 41, paragraph 0843, that message-oriented middleware vendors may support SOAP messaging, with additional provider classes *that enable SOAP messaging over different data transports including WebSphere MQ and JMS*. SOAP acts as an intermediary for exchanging messages over different data transport layers by using eXtensible Markup Language (XML) as its message format. However, neither SOAP nor any other portion of Lai discloses a wrapper that enables a queue that employs a non-publication/subscription notification type of architecture to operate as a publication/subscription notification type of architecture. Applicants note that Lai discusses in paragraphs [0564]-[0568] (illustrated in FIGS. 28 and 29) a process relating to publishing messages to subscribers. However, Lai does not teach or suggest in any way a wrapper that enables a queue that employs a non-publication/subscription notification type of architecture to operate as a publication/subscription notification type of architecture. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicants assert that the combination of the cited references does not teach or suggest each and every element of the limitations as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

For at least the same or similar reasons as presented above with regard to Claim 1, independent Claims 16 and 26 are also patentable over the combination of the cited references. In addition, the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness against Claim 16 at least because the Office Action does not even address all the limitations recited in Claim 16. For example, Claim 16 recites, in part, *verifying that the business component has received the message*. In lumping the rejections of Claim 16 with Claim 1, the Office Action completely fails to even address the above limitation, in addition to other limitations of Claim 16. Therefore, the Office Action clearly fails to even establish a prima facie case of obviousness against Claim 16 based on the cited references. Therefore, claims 16 and 26 are also patentable over the cited references.

The remaining claims are also patentable over the combination of the cited references at least by virtue of their dependency on Claims 1, 16, and 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to Claims 1-34 and 42-46 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action. If the Examiner feels a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

Applicants believe no fee is due. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-2816, under Order No. 11000060-0033 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 14, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By /Nam Huynh/  
Nam Huynh  
Registration No.: 60,703  
Sonnenschein, Nath & Rosenthal  
2000 McKinney, Suite 1900  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
(214) 259-0971  
Fax #: (214) 259-0910  
Attorney for Applicants